

## **REMARKS**

The above-referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action, dated May 17, 2004, in which: Drawings and Abstract are objected to; and claims 8-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Adusumilli. Reconsideration of the above-referenced patent application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

No claims have been added or amended. Therefore, claims 8-20 are pending in the application.

### **102(e) Rejection**

The Applicant sincerely appreciates the Examiner's response to the Applicant's arguments on page 4. However, the Examiner did not carefully read our argument. As previously discussed in the prior reply and repeated below, the Applicant argues that Adusumilli does not teach, **"selecting both the first test access port controller and second access port controller for a second mode of operation"**. In contrast, the Examiner concentrated on "selecting either TAP controller". We repeat our assertion that Adusumilli does not teach, "selecting both TAP controllers for a second mode of operation" as taught in Applicant's pending patent application.

Here is an excerpt from the previous office action reply:


"The Examiner has argued that Adusumilli anticipates the claimed subject matter in Applicant's pending patent. Specifically, Examiner argues this based on the Abstract and Column 1, lines 45-50. However, Applicant argues that Examiner does not appreciate the teaching of the Applicant's claimed subject matter, specifically, relating to the claim limitation of **"selecting both the first test access port controller and second access port**

controller for a second mode of operation". The applicant does not find any teaching of this limitation in Adusumilli. Adusumilli alleviates the need to transfer control from one TAP controller to another. In contrast, the Applicant allows enabling one or two TAP controllers based on the mode of operation of the particular SOC or integrated device.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that all of the claims pending in this patent application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact Michael J. Nesheiwat at (503) 712 8918. Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 10, 2005

Gregory D. Caldwell, Reg. No. 39,926  
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP

12400 Wilshire Blvd., Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 712 8918